

By



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,447	01/08/2002	Stephan Oliver Mietens	PHNL 010028	4625
24737	7590	09/16/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			LERNER, MARTIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/042,447	Applicant(s) MIETENS ET AL.	
	Examiner Martin Lerner	Art Unit 2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 to 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 to 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1 and 14 to 18 set forth the limitation that for a given coefficient the calculation cost is "not greater than prior selected coefficients costs", which involves new matter because there is no disclosure of the limitation in the originally-filed Specification. Indeed, the cited limitation is directly contrary to Applicants' Specification.

Applicants' Remarks point to support for the limitation as found on Page 9, Lines 12 to 20, of the Specification, which state, "Using this database, we focus on finding the next DCT coefficient that needs the least operations, depending on the calculations already done. This will give an algorithm-dependent calculation order of the coefficients . . . which leads to less remaining calculation cost for  $B_1$  than  $B_3$  in the second step.

This can be seen in Table 2, where the database of Table 1 has been updated by the information, that  $B_2$  has been calculated.”

However, the originally filed Specification does not say either expressly or implicitly that a given coefficient has a calculation cost that “is not greater than prior selected coefficient calculation costs”. Instead, the Specification discloses finding the next coefficient that needs the least operations, based on calculations already done. The next coefficient to be calculated has the next least great cost in a progression from a least calculation cost to a next least calculation cost, given shared calculation costs of prior calculations already performed. If a calculation cost of a coefficient is “not greater than prior” coefficient calculation costs, then that coefficient would already be calculated according to Applicants’ algorithm-dependent calculation order, which requires starting with a coefficient that has a least calculation cost and then progressively calculating a coefficient with a next greater calculation cost, given shared calculation costs between coefficients.

Applicants’ Specification, Page 9, discloses that coefficient  $B_2$  is calculated first because a calculation cost involves only three operations, whereas coefficient  $B_1$  and coefficient  $B_3$  both involve calculation costs of four operations. (Table 1) Then, given that the operations for coefficient  $B_2$  are already performed, the calculation cost of coefficient  $B_1$  is reduced to three operations and the calculation cost of coefficient  $B_3$  remains at four operations. (Table 2) Thus, coefficient  $B_1$  is calculated next, because the calculation cost is less than that for coefficient  $B_3$ , but it is noted that the calculation cost of coefficient  $B_1$  is three operations, which is neither greater nor lesser than the

Art Unit: 2654

prior calculation cost for coefficient  $B_2$ , which was also three operations. In general, one would not expect that a calculation cost for a next coefficient would necessarily be either greater or lesser than a calculation cost for a prior coefficient already calculated, just that a lesser calculation cost of remaining coefficients determines a next coefficient to be calculated. For example, if original calculation costs for coefficients  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ , and  $B_3$  were 6, 3, and 7, respectively, then coefficient  $B_2$  would be calculated first, but then post-shared calculation cost of coefficients  $B_1$  and  $B_3$  could conceivably be 1 and 2, respectively, could remain at 6 and 7, respectively, or could be reduced to 4 and 5, respectively.

Therefore, Applicants' claim language of a calculation cost of a given coefficient "is not greater than prior selected coefficient calculation costs" is new matter because there is neither any express or implied disclosure of the limitation in the originally-filed Specification.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Lerner whose telephone number is (571) 272-7608. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML  
9/12/05

  
Martin Lerner  
Examiner  
Group Art Unit 2654